

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully acknowledges receipt of the Office Action mailed on October 16, 2007.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11-16 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Parrott et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,817,598); rejected claims 23, 25, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Davis* (U.S. Patent No. 4,735,402); and objected to claims 17-22, 24, 26, 29, 30, and 32 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 11, 20, 23, 24, 27, and 28, adds new claim 33, and cancels claims 19 and 29, without prejudice or disclaimer. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 11-18, 20-28, and 30-33 will be pending. Of these claims, claims 11, 23, and 27 are independent.

The originally-filed specification, claims, abstract, and drawings fully support the amendments to claims 11, 20, 23, 24, 27, and 28, and the addition of new claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant believes that no new matter has been introduced.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 17-22, 24, 26, 29, 30, and 32 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Consequently, Applicant has amended claim 11 to include the feature of allowable claim 19, and has cancelled claim 19. In addition, Applicant has amended claim 23 to include a feature of allowable claim 24, and has amended claim 27 to include the feature of allowable claim

29, and has cancelled claim 29. Accordingly, independent claims 11, 23, and 27 are in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 12-18, 20-22, 24-26, 28, and 30-33 are in condition for allowance at least due to their corresponding dependence from independent claims 11, 23, and 27.

Applicant traverses the rejections above and respectfully requests reconsideration for at least the reasons set forth below.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 11-16 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Parrott*. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended claim 11 to include the feature of allowable claim 19. It is that feature which the Examiner admits is not disclosed in either *Parrott* or any other prior art of record. (*Office Action*, p. 3, paragraph 4). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 11-16 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 17, 18, 20-22, 31, and 33 are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence from independent claim 11.

Claims 23, 25, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Davis*. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended claim 23 to include a feature of allowable claim 24, and has amended claim 27 to include the feature of allowable claim 29. It is those features which the Examiner admits are not disclosed in either *Davis* or any other prior art of record. (*Office Action*, p. 3, paragraph 4). Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 23, 25, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 24, 26, and 30, and 32 are in condition for allowance at least due to their corresponding dependence from independent claims 23 and 27.

II. NEW CLAIM

New claim 33 depends from claim 11 and is allowable at least for the same reasons claim 11 is allowable. In addition, the dependent claim recites unique combinations that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art, and therefore is also separately patentable.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 11, 23, and 27 are in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 12-18, 20-22, 24-26, 28, and 30-33 are in condition for allowance at least due to their corresponding dependence from claims 11, 23, and 27.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicant does not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicant declines to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 15, 2008

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220